DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 021 548 JC 680 298

By- Roman, Paul A.
SAN DIEGO CITY COLLEGE ACADEMIC SENATE: A CRITICAL EVALUATION.
Pub Date 6 Jun 68
Note- 23p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.00
Descriptors- COLLEGE FACULTY, *COMMUNICATION (THOUGHT TRANSFER), FACULTY, *FACULTY ORGANIZATIONS, *GOVERNANCE, *JUNIOR COLLEGES, POLICY, *POLICY FORMATION, QUESTIONNAIRES, SURVEYS
Identifiers- *California, San Diego

In an assessment of the relat onship of the Academic Senate to the faculty and administration at San Diego City College, the Senate's effectiveness in terms of recommendations to the administration and the governing board, and the Senate's effectiveness in its communication with the individual faculty members , a tabulation of the Senate's more than 240 resolutions which were passed between January 1964 and June 1966 was made. The resolutions fell into three categories: (1) housekeeping (budget), (2) academic design of new courses), and (3) personnel (faculty load). A poll of 138 faculty members showed that (1) 75% believed that the Senate considered minority opinions of the faculty "most of the time," 20% indicated minority views," (2) 90% felt that the Senate's decisions "generally or almost always agreed" with their opinions, (3) most (figure not reported) of the faculty appeared to keep informed about the actions of the Senate by reading the minutes of the Senate, and (4) 5% of the faculty indicated that they had attended meetings of the faculty senate. The author concluded that the faculty was pleased with the actions of the Senate and that there were no major problems with lines of communication. (DG)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

SAN DIEGO CITY COLLEGE ACADEMIC SENATE:

A CRITICAL EVALUATION

A Research Report

Presented to

Doctor James Yelvington

University of California at Los Angeles

In Partial Fulfillment

of Junior College Administrative Internship

Education 449

JC 680 298
ED021548

by

Paul A. Roman

June 6, 1968

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

JUN 20 1968

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	THE PROBLEM	1
	Statement of the problem	1
	Significance of the problem	1
II.	REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	2
III.	EVALUATION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE AT SAN DIEGO CITY COLLEGE	10
	Critical evaluation of minutes	10
	Faculty poll and results	17
IV.	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	20
V.	BIBLIOGRAPHY	21

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Statement of the problem: It is the purpose of this study to answer the following questions: (1) Is the Academic Senate at San Diego City College effective in its relationship with the faculty and administration of the college? (2) Is the Academic Senate effective in its recommendations to the administration and the governing board? (3) Is the Academic Senate effective in its communication with individual faculty members?

Significance of the problem: The rapid and dramatic junior college student population increase, with all its concomitant ratifications, has created a multiplicity of problems for all persons concerned with the California junior colleges. One of the most pressing and ever increasing problems is the demand of the faculties for more widespread participation in policy formulation with the junior college governance.

The Donahoe Act of 1960 officially recognized the junior colleges as part of the California higher education tripartite system and in 1963 the California legislature took cognizance of the fact that the wealth of the junior college faculties' talent and experience could be utilized in policy formulation by the establishment of academic senate.

During the 1965 session of the legislature, the Winton Act became law and negotiating councils were established. The storm broke at this time since the Winton Act did not exclude junior colleges, and in many districts negotiating councils were fighting academic senates for the right of negotiating for the teachers. Therefore, the legitimacy of the academic senate became a prime goal of the junior college faculties. Junior college administrators were also concerned with this turn of events, since they were beginning to become accustomed to working with the academic senate and therefore as one administrator stated it, "the academic senate is what we should be backing . . . it's far lesser the evil than a negotiating council."

In reality this comment represents only the minority view since most of the presidents respect the integrity and honesty that academic senates bring to their tasks.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The Donahoe Act in 1960, which included the junior college in the system of higher education in the state of California, brought with it a

new problem, a sudden change in the perception of the role of junior college teachers and the governance of colleges in which they teach. Dr. Dale Tillery studied the question and reported:

> All the participants in this move toward collegiality---legislators, trustees, administrators, and teachers--have sought some model which would be particularly appropriate for the community college. None seems quite right. Although a few faculty leaders continue to be attracted to the Academic Senate of the University of California and similar bodies, there is increasing awareness within faculty associations that junior colleges may need a more flexible and democratic organization for influencing policy. (6:27)

Roger Garrison agreed that some vehicle was necessary but the purpose was more important than the system. He wrote:

> What, for instance, do faculty want from their administrations?

They say:

> As faculty, we want most especially to have a major say in how our colleges create and offer programs. This includes their content, methods of presentation, and materials of instruction. We are less concerned with traditional faculty prerogatives than we are in having a reasonable total context in which we can do a professional job: adequate pay and fringe benefits, enough facilities and equipment, reasonable teaching loads, chances for our own professional growth, and an administrative set-up flexible and responsive enough to hear and give weight to our opinions and recommendations. If we, as faculty, have a real functional effect in creating and maintaining this context in our colleges, then we are performing our proper role in sharing in the governing of them. (3:16)

Through the leadership of the California Junior College Faculty Association and the American Federation of Teachers, Assembly Resolution No. 48 was passed and signed by the governor. Dr. Dale Tillery observed this and stated:

> It is interesting to note that CJCFA and AFT leaders have consistently sought state involvement and action in matters which traditionally have been local responsibilities. This philosophy was clearly stated in a July 1964 position paper by the CJCFA. "From the point of view of the faculty association, most of the real gains in junior college education have come through legislation." (6:27)

Assembly Resolution No. 48 encouraged the establishment of academic senates in junior colleges, and within a year the state Board of Education implemented the resolution by adding Section 131. 6 to Title 5 of the California Administrative Code.

The early part of 1964 saw many drives toward establishment of some type of senate or council. Numerous articles were written in the Junior College Journal starting in March 1964, when Bill Priest suggested that the future success of the junior college movement is directly related to the type of working relationship which is maintained between faculty and administration. (4:8)

In July 1964, the Peralta Junior College district was formed and chose as its superintendent John W. Dunn. Dunn quickly recognized

not only the importance of senates at each junior college, but also the function of a powerful Peralta Colleges' Council. Dunn wrote the following:

> It is the general policy of the Peralta Colleges to utilize faculty opinion, in areas of their competence, in the development of the colleges... council recommendations to the Board contain the best thinking of all concerned.
>
> Toward this end, each college will establish problem-solving procedures which directly involve faculty and which encourage a continuous dialogue and unrestricted flow of relevant information. (2:11)

Dunn also stated that the entire potential of an organizational pattern of this type calls for a knowledgeable and understanding Board of Trustees. It alone can make the communication channels function. Each board members must understand that his status as a board member exists only when a board is convened in a meeting. Also, the system will be further strenghtened when staff members discover that it gets results and that the channels work, whereas other means of communication meet with failure. (2:12)

Interestingly enough both the San Diego Junior College Faculty Senate Council and the Peralta College's Council were illegal at this point since Section 131. 6 of Title 5 makes provisions for each college but not for district councils. The code is as follows:

131.6 Academic Senates or Faculty Councils.

(a) For the purpose of this section.

(1) "Faculty" means those certificated persons who teach full-time in a junior college or other full-time certificated persons who do not perform any services for the college that requires an administrative or supervisory credential.

(2) "Academic Senate" or "Faculty Council" means an organization formed in accordance with this section whose primary function is, as the representative of the faculty, to make recommendations to the administration and the governing board of a school district with respect to academic and professional matters.

(b) In order that the faculty may have a formal and effective procedure for participating in the formation of district policies on academic and professional matters described in (a) (2), the faculty first must decide by secret ballot to have an "academic senate" or "faculty council" in <u>each</u> junior college by authoriz ing the faculty to:

(1) Fix and amend, by vote of the faculty, the composition, structure, and procedures of the academic senate or faculty council.

(2) Select, in accordance with accepted democratic election procedures, the members of the academic senate or faculty council.

(c) The academic senate or faculty council shall present its written views and recommendations to the governing board through regularly established channels. However, the senate or council, after consultation with the administration, may present its views and recommendations directly to the governing board.

(d) The governing board shall consider such views and recommendations. It may entertain oral presentations thereof by the senate or council at any board meeting.

Note: Authority cited: Sections 152 and 22650, Education Code.

History: 1. New section filed 9/14/64 as an emergency; effective upon filing (Register 64, No. 19).

2. Certificate of compliance--Section 11422.1, Government Code, filed 11/17/64 (Register 64 No. 23). (1:15)

The language in Section 131.5 Title 5 was perfectly clear until in 1965 when the Winton Act became law and negotiating councils were established. The Winton Act was in reality written in order to bring the elementary and secondary teachers into some type of an organization that could "meet and confer" with the governing board.

The wording of the Winton Act closely paralleled that of the California Code covering employee organizations and was authored by the California Teachers Association. The broadness of coverage was intentional to the extent that the association has membership in all levels of education from elementary schools through the state colleges.

Only a few members of the California Junior College Faculty Association recognized the dangers of the wording in the Winton Act, but too late to affect a change in the wording or to exclude the junior college from the bill.

In many colleges the Winton Act was not a danger, especially if the junior college was in a separate district. In these particular

districts the negotiating council was never formed. The unified districts posed another problem, however, since the negotiating council was composed of only nine (maximum) representatives of employee groups in the district, and the junior college faculty represented only a small percentage of the teachers. This actually resulted in negotiating councils having no representative from the junior college faculty.

In the San Diego Unified School District the governing board continued to recognize the Faculty Senate Council as the voice of the junior colleges. Other junior colleges were not so fortunate.

Finally the California Junior College Faculty Association approached the Junior College Advisory Panel to the state Board of Education concerning this matter. The Advisory Panel meets monthly for two days, and the March and April meetings in 1967 were largely devoted to this particular problem. The American Federation of Teachers representative urged outright repeal of the Winton Act and the California Teachers Association defended the legislation.

The discussion was mainly centered around the permissive wording of Section 131. 6 and after exhaustive debate, the panel resolved that it was the consensus that the academic senates need to be strenghtened to

the extent that they operate on a par with negotiating councils. And furthermore, after consultation with the administration the academic senate or faculty council may present its written views and recommendations to the governing board. The governing board shall consider and respond to such views and recommendations. (5:1)

Since the dialogue has continued concerning the effectiveness of the junior college academic senate, the California Junior College Faculty Association has initiated a move to organize a statewide junior college academic senate with membership from any junior college desiring such representation.

The San Diego Junior Colleges are in the process of applying for accreditation and the evaluation of faculty organizations is a part of such an application. Therefore, the author conducted the following study of the San Diego City College Academic Senate.

CHAPTER III

EVALUATION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE AT SAN DIEGO CITY COLLEGE

CRITICAL EVALUATION OF MINUTES: Academic Senate minutes, from January 1964 through June 1966, were carefully evaluated and resolutions were extracted and categorized. A follow-up to each of the resolutions as to final status was accomplished. Resolutions fell into the three following categories:

1. Housekeeping: Those resolutions moved, seconded, and carried which related to routine matters in the Senate; i.e., acceptance of budget, acceptance of committee reports, acceptance of resolutions having to do with the order of business.
2. Academic: Those resolutions having to do with curricular matters; i.e., designs for new courses, establishment of prerequisites, requirements for various curricula, etc.
3. Personnel: Those resolutions having to do with individual problems; i.e., faculty load, etc.

In attempting to evaluate the faculty government at San Diego City College, the following questions were stated and answered:

1. What is the recognized relationship between the Senate and (1) the administration, and (2) the Board of Education? Is this relationship in writing?
2. Is the actual relationship the same as stated above?

ANSWER: The relationship between the Senate and the administration as well as the Board of Education is spelled out in addition to the Rules and Regulations of the Board of Education Nos. 4016 and 4017, stated as follows:

4016: The faculty at each of the operating units of the San Diego Junior Colleges is authorized to establish a faculty senate for the purpose of providing for faculty participation in the formation of policy on academic and professional matters within that college. The faculty senate may make studies and recommendation to or through the chief administrator of the college.

4017: The faculty senates of the individual college units may join to establish a facaulty senate council for the purpose of providing faculty participation in the formation of policy on academic and professional matters and to make or to coordinate studies or recommendations on academic or professional matters with implications for the

total junior college program. The findings or recommendations of the faculty senate council should be directed to or through the President of the San Diego Junior Colleges.

The relationship of the Senate to the administration and Board of Education has proven to be close and effective according to the stated guidelines. The Senate has at all times attempted to work through the President of the junior colleges and according to the vast majority of the resolutions, this procedure has proven to be effective.

From January 1964, when the first minutes were available, until June 1966, approximately 240 - plus resolutions were approved and acted upon. Forty-three percent of these motions were presented by the Academic Affairs Committee, thirty percent were from the Faculty Personnel Affairs Committee, and the remaining were from various committees and constituted the housekeeping resolutions, the latter included resolutions from such committees as the social committee, lounge committee, and any other faculty association committee constituted for a special reason.

It would be impossible to list all of the items submitted by the Academic Affairs Committee which were placed in resolution form and are presently in effect.

In the following resolutions it is worth noting that some resolutions took a couple of years to achieve and become effective, while others were implemented as quickly as the President of the college could put them into effect.

1. A final examination schedule was established for the Arts and Science Division.
2. A liaison committee was established between junior colleges and state colleges.
3. Faculty was represented on the Instructional Review Committee.
4. Department chairmen were elected by departments.
5. Faculty Senate Council was founded and recognized.
6. Free textbook selection by faculty.
7. Sick pay for evening teachers.
8. General Studies Program was established at City College.
9. Faculty Association President was granted released time.
10. Clerical assistance was given to Senate.
11. Faculty Association President assisted in interviewing administrative applicants.
12. A counselor was assigned for foreign students (duty given to a regular counselor for the present time).

13. A full-time classified person was hired and attached to handle placement, etc.
14. A matron was hired to work in women's P. E. program.
15. A full-time institutional research person was hired and attached to Director of Curriculum Office.
16. Clerical aide was hired for assistance to instructors whose paper load is heavy.
17. Readers were hired for assistance to instructors whose paper load is heavy.
18. The bell system was abolished.
19. That individual colleges were allowed to hire spouses of instructors of the other colleges.
20. That the faculty is represented in the master planning of each campus.
21. Established a period of five non-teaching days between semesters.
22. The faculty became a part of the hiring process.
23. Three areas were vacated to make room for faculty and students.
24. A hot food line was established for the faculty lounge.

The resolutions which are still pending are as follows:

'64-11/30 1. The technical division be placed on a final schedule.

'64 -1/13 2. That a special committee be established to study the district budget. (This was done partially).

'64 -2/10 3. Complete a full teacher load study.

'65 -2/ 8 4. A feasibility study of a student union building.

'65 -2/ 8 5. That the bookstore at City College be autonomous with a manager on the campus to make all purchases.

'65 -5/ 5 6. That all student body money be spent only on student activities.

'65 -9/20 7. That card playing be prohibited on campus except in sponsored clubs.

'65 -3/30 8. That each college may hire retired faculty on an hourly basis.

'66 -2/ 7 9. That hourly instructors be paid for attending department meetings.

A little background might be beneficial at this point concerning some of the above items:

2. This committee will begin to function late this spring and will be actually involved in studying the district budget. This is due in part to the fact that the Board has gone on record (on paper only) to study the feasibility of a separate district in San Diego.

3-4. Items Nos. 3 and 4 are not complete due to the fact that special committees assigned to complete the studies did not do so and therefore these items must be debited to the Senate's account.

The remaining items are still on the record with no action as yet.

It is interesting to note that the only reference to salary in the senate minutes is related directly to acceptance of a Faculty Association Committee Report, and at no time has the senate directly involved itself in the process of negotiating for salaries.

Since the senates at San Diego City, Mesa, and Evening Colleges have joined together into a common affiliation through an organization entitled The Faculty Senate Council, with all three senates having representation of five of its executive members.

Many benefits derived by the action of the academic senate have come about without the necessity of a resolution on both City and Mesa campuses.

Benefits of one senate can clearly be benefits of all three. In most cases the president or chairman of the senate and president of the college discussed resolutions and either corrected the situation immediately, or the resolution was forwarded to the faculty senate. The lines of communication have been opened and the directives from the Board have been clear from the outset that the faculty has a clear line to take any matter to the college president, superintendent, and if necessary, then to the Board of Education. Up to this point, no resolution has had to go directly to the Board.

In order to ascertain the feelings of the faculty, the following questionnaire was distributed to 145 faculty members. Ninety-five (95) percent were returned. The questionnaire read as follows:

FACULTY POLL

Is the Senate effective in the eyes of the faculty? The faculty was polled concerning their evaluation of the Senate by using the following questions:

A. Do you feel that the faculty senate properly considers minority opinions of the faculty?

1. They are very careful to do this
2. Most of the time
3. Some of the time
4. They are very careful to avoid minority views

RESULTS: Seventy-five (75) percent of the faculty indicated there was communication ranging from "most of the time" to "they are very careful to do this." An additional twenty (20) percent indicated "some of the time," while three (3) faculty members indicated "they were careful to avoid minority views."

B. Do you feel that faculty senate decisions, as published in the faculty senate minutes, adequately represent your opinions?

1. Almost always agree with them
2. Generally agree with them
3. Generally disagree with them
4. Almost always disagree with them

RESULTS: Ninety (90) percent stated that they "generally or almost always agreed" while only three (3) faculty members indicated they "generally disagreed."

C. By which of the following means do you keep informed of the actions of the faculty senate?

1. Reading faculty senate minutes
2. Talking to my department senator
3. Talking to other senators
4. Through the grapevine
5. All of the above
6. I don't keep informed of the actions of the faculty senate

RESULTS: The faculty appears to keep informed by "reading faculty senate minutes" and "all of the above", while only one indicated he learned "through the grapevine", and one other indicated "I don't keep informed."

D. Have you attended any of the meetings of the faculty senate this current school year? (Please do not answer if you are a senator or a senate officer)

1. Yes
2. No

RESULTS: Only six (6) faculty members indicated that they had attended meetings of the faculty senate.

Results of the questionnaire clearly indicated that the faculty was pleased with the actions of the academic senate and there no major problems with lines of communication.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The evaluation of the minutes as well as the poll of the faculty have clearly indicated that the academic senate at San Diego City College is effective in its dealings with faculty, administration, and the governing board. At no instance was there an indication of any type of blow-up resulting from inaction of the administration in response to a resolution. It is also worthwhile to note that the largest percentage of resolutions dealt with academic matters and were not part of a negotiating procedure.

An examination of the Constitution and By Laws of the Academic Senate indicated that the basic documents are still operative but need many minor revisions. These are being compiled and a committee has been established to present final copy to the senate prior to the end of this semester.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bandley, Marion K., "Relationships of Faculty Senates (Councils) to the Administrative Staff, Presidents and/or Superintendents, and Board of Trustees in sixty-eight California Junior Colleges as reported by the Presidents or Vice-Presidents. Based on a Questionnaire Survey of Opinions carried out between February and May 1967, San Joaquin Delta College, Stockton, 1967.

Dunn, John W., Peter Jowise, and Ralph Jentile, "Our Faculty Participates in Policy Development." Junior College Journal, 37:10, December 1966/January 1967.

Garrison, Roger H., "The Teacher's Professional Situation." Junior College Journal, 37:16, March 1967.

Priest, Bill J., "Faculty Administrator Relationships." Junior College Journal, 35:8, March 1964.

State Board of Education Junior College Advisory Panel Minutes of Meeting April 28, 1967, San Francisco. Resolution page one (1) Addendum.

Tillery, Dr. Dale, "California Junior College Education." A consideration of Issues Affecting California Public Junior Colleges. A Report of the Coordinating Council for Higher Education, Sacramento and San Francisco, April 1965.